UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,977	05/14/2001	Scott LeKuch	YOR920000703US1	9087
7590 02/08/2008 Harry F. Smith, Esq. Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.			EXAMINER	
			VO, HUYEN X	
10th Floor One Landmark Square		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Stamford, CT 06901-2682			2626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comme	09/854,977	LEKUCH ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Huyen X. Vo	2626				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim viil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/21	/2007					
<i>,</i>	,_					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-3,8-13 and 18-23</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
' 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,8-13 and 18-23</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
•	8) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8 Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers	•					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
	or the defamed depice het receive	u .				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application Other:						
	- 					

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection in view of Sekiguchi (US 6185604), necessitated by claim amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-3, 8, 10-13, 18, 20-21, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marmor (US 6601108) in view of Sekiguchi (US 6185604).
- 4. Regarding claims 1, 11, and 21, Marmor discloses a computing system, method, and storage medium, said computing system comprising:

a communication link for bi-directionally providing a communication channel between a host computing device and a companion computing device, wherein said host computing device has access to at least one database in which a plurality of messages are each stored in a plurality of different languages (figures 1A-B, client device and server are in a bi-directional communication):

wherein said companion computing device comprises a display device and further comprises a control device that responds to a user request for one of said plurality of messages in a first one of said plurality of languages not supported by said companion device to transmit said request to said host computing device over said communication link (figure 3 or col. 10, line 63 to col. 11, line 67; client device request for a particular document in a particular language, the server retrieves and supplies the requested document to the client device);

wherein said host computing device responds to a receipt of said request for the requested message by retrieving said message in said first language from said memory and converting the retrieved message into a representation that corresponds to the requested message in said first language (the operation of figures 1A-B; converter converts the document to a format supported by the client device; or referring to the operation of figure 6, the server retrieves the requested document and determine if the client device supports said document, and convert the document into a format supported by client device), wherein said host computing device transmits to said companion computing device the retrieved bitmap representation of the requested message over said communication link for display on said companion display device in said first language (figures 1A-B), wherein the requested message is comprised of at least multiple characters of said language (within the scope of the reference, the requested document includes multiple characters), wherein the requested message is formatted for display device (figures 1A-B, converter does this).

09/854,977

Art Unit: 2626

Marmor fails to specifically disclose wherein said companion computing device, without conversion from character codes to graphic elements, presents the bitmap representation as a full screen image of the requested message on said display device. However, Sekiguchi teaches that said companion computing device, without conversion from character codes to graphic elements, presents the bitmap representation as a full screen image of the requested message on said display device (abstract section; converting email document to image data or bitmap data).

Since Marmor and Sekiguchi are analogous arts because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Marmor by incorporating the teaching of Sekiguchi in order to enable devices of small processing power to access data of different languages.

- 5. Regarding claims 2-3, 12-13, and 22, Mamor further discloses wherein said complete message further comprises a character set (*figure 2, HTML document includes character set*), wherein individual ones of a plurality of said databases are each associated with a specific language (*figure 4, different languages*).
- 6. Regarding claims 8, 18, and 23, Marmor fails to specifically disclose that the companion computing device stores the image representation transmitted from said host computing device for later use. However, Sekiguchi teaches that the companion computing device stores the image representation transmitted from said host computing device for later use (col. 15, lines 19-24, can be a PC for storing the image data).

Since Marmor and Sekiguchi are analogous arts because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Marmor by incorporating the teaching of Sekiguchi in order to enable user to view the requested document in a later time.

- 7. Regarding claims 10 and 20, Mamor further discloses that the communication link is a wired or wireless (*within the scope of the reference*).
- 8. Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marmor (US 66601108) in view of Sekiguchi (US 6185604), and further in view of Official Notice.
- 9. Regarding claims 9 and 19, Mamor fails to specifically disclose that the companion computing device comprises a digitizer input system having an electronic pen or stylus for handwritten information. However, examiner takes the official notice that it is extremely well known that a typical PDA comprises an electronic pen/stylus for the input of handwritten information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Marmor to use a PDA with a styluses/electronic pens in order to provide users with convenient access to data.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huyen X. Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HXV

1/29/2008